

Remarks

Claims 1-29 are at issue. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-18, 2-23, & 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Jamtgaard et al (USPN 643024). Claims 6, 10, 12, 19, 24, 28 & 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al in view of Povilus (US 5740425).

The applicant respectfully submits that there is no requirement for the header "Brief Summary of the Invention" under the law and chooses not to have such a header.

The Jamtgaard reference is concerned with presenting internet information to wireless appliances. (See FIGs. 1 & 2) As a result, not all the information being translated is data and not all the data or information is translated into the new format. Jamtgaard states "the content cutter 72 cuts data classes that are not appropriate for the requesting device 15" at Column 13, lines 45-49. The present invention is a data conversion system, it does not "cut" data that is not appropriate. Thus the Jamtgaard reference teaches away from the present invention. These and other differences are reflected in the claims.

Claim 1 requires a template defining the second hierarchical scheme. The Examiner points to FIG. 9 item 122 as the template. However, Jamtgaard is clear that item 122 is an RML page (Col. 13, line 6). The RML page is not a template it contains all the data shown in the HTML file 124. There is no discussion of a template, just the finished RML file. The RML page 122 is actually analogous to the output (e.g., a file contain the data in the second hierarchical data scheme) of the present invention as defined in claim 1.

Claim 1 also requires a dynamic data generation module. The Examiner points to Col. 13, lines 20-33 where Jamtgaard discusses the content cutter 72. The content cutter removes data from the RML file that is inappropriate. The present application explains the dynamic generation module 24 has a query 28 and driver for acquiring data from a data source. (Page 6, lines 5-10) There is no query shown in the content cutter or a driver. In addition, the dynamic data generation module is inside the template. There is no indication that the content cutter is inside the RML file. Finally, there is no indication that the content cutter is in communication with a data source having data in the first hierarchical data scheme. Claim 1 is clearly allowable over the prior art.

Claims 2 is allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 3 requires a dynamic data generation module and this is not found in Jamtgaard. Claim 3 is allowable.

Claim 4 requires a dynamic data generation module and this is not found in Jamtgaard. Claim 4 is allowable

Claim 5 requires a template. For the reasons cited with respect to claim 1, the RML file 122 pointed to by the Examiner is not a template. Claim 5 is allowable over prior art.

Claims 6 & 7 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 5.

Claims 8 & 9 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claim.

Claim 10 requires a query to a data source. The applicant does not see how Povilus contains a query in a dynamic data generation module. Clearly, Jamtgaard does not have a dynamic data generation module. Claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 11 requires a dynamic data generation module. The RML page 122 is not a mapping module. At best it is an example of how to manually map data between two data schemes. In addition, the RML page was cited by the Examiner as the template. The RML page cannot be both the template and the data mapping module. In fact, the RML page is more the result of a data conversion process not an element required for the process. Claim 11 is allowable.

Claim 12 requires a dynamic data generation module and this is not found in Jamtgaard. Claim 12 is allowable.

Claim 13 requires a dynamic template. The Examiner points to Col. 7, lines 26-30 which talks about how desktop PCs do not need their requests redirected to the invention described in Jamtgaard. It is hard to see how this is relevant. Jamtgaard does not show a template. In addition, Jamtgaard does not contain a dynamic data generation module. The Examiner points to RML page 122. The RML page is more the result of a data conversion process not the element required for the process. Claim 13 is allowable.

Claim 14 requires a template. The RML page is not a template it contains all the data shown in the HTML file 124. There is no discussion of a template, just the finished RML file. The RML page 122 is actually analogous to the output (e.g., a file contain the data in the second hierarchical data scheme) of the present invention as defined in claim 14. In addition, there is no discussion dynamically generated data.

Claims 15-17 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 requires a template. The RML page is not a template it contains all the data shown in the HTML file 124. There is no discussion of a template, just the finished RML file. The RML page 122 is actually analogous to the output (e.g., a file contain the data in the second hierarchical data scheme) of the present invention as defined in claim 18. In addition, there is no discussion dynamically generated data.

Claims 19-21 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 22 requires that when a datum needs to be dynamically generated there is a query to the data source. There is no discussion of dynamically generating data in the prior art. Claim 22 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 23 requires a screen of list elements. The Examiner points to FIGs. 9A & B. This clearly does not show a list of elements. It shows a HTML document and the converted RML document. A list of elements would just show the elements not all the data and attributes. Clearly this is not a list of elements. Claim 23 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 24 requires a first color for a static element and a second color for dynamic element of a template. The section pointed to by the Examiner only discusses the color of products in a catalog. It clearly does not discuss the color of dynamic and static elements in a template. Claim 24 is allowable.

Claim 25 is allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 26 requires a sample extensible markup language file and determining if each element needs to be dynamically processed. The RML page is not a sample XML file, it contains all the data shown in the HTML file 124. There is no discussion of a sample XML file, just the finished RML file. The RML page 122 is actually analogous to the output (e.g., a file contain the data in the second hierarchical data scheme) of the present invention as defined in claim 26. In addition, there is no discussion dynamically generated data.

Claim 27 is allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 28 requires receiving a query type. There is nothing in the section pointed to by the Examiner about a query type. There is also nothing about generating a query. The section pointed to by the Examiner just states the file is converted to RML, but not how this is done. Claim 28 is allowable.

Claim 29 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 28.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Vandersluis)

By



Dale B. Halling

Attorney for the Applicant


Registration No. 38,170

Phone: (719) 447-1990

Fax: (719) 447-9815

I hereby certify that an Amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on:

10/7/03
Date


Signature (Dale B. Halling)